

touched, even to safeguard our economic security. I would argue that concerns to this degree do not properly balance America's physical security needs against its economic security needs. With the SPR almost full, we can easily reduce 30 million barrels through a swap and still have an effective safeguard against a physical supply disruption.

Initiating a swap of oil from the SPR to increase the supply of oil is a proven way to reduce the price of gasoline and heating oil. In the fall of 2000, the Clinton administration announced a swap of 30 million barrels over 30 days, causing crude oil prices to quickly fall by over \$6 a barrel and wholesale prices to fall 14 cents a gallon. Under a swap, the Federal Government could decide on a set quantity of oil to release from the SPR and accept bids from private companies for the rights to that oil. The companies would then bid on how much oil they would be willing to return, in addition to the oil they would receive under the swap, to the SPR at a later date.

The administration has had these tools in its hands and could have acted more quickly, earlier, to stand up for the American consumer, but it has not. Instead, despite repeated urgings from Members of this body, among others, it has steadfastly refused to intervene and to allow oil prices to soar. It has been good for oil companies, it has been good for OPEC and bad for the American consumer.

This amendment says enough is enough and gives this body an opportunity to do what others have refused by hitting the breaks to stop runaway gasoline prices.

An oil swap would result in a win-win situation where gasoline prices are lowered and long-term contributions to the SPR are augmented at no additional cost to the taxpayers. The SPR is intended to provide relief at times when American families are struggling to make ends meet. The time is now. The summer driving months are just beginning.

I urge my colleagues to join me in protecting the pocketbooks of working families from OPEC profiteering by supporting this amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, we will not argue our case against the case of the Senator from New York yet. We will do that tomorrow. Suffice it to say we are talking about a reserve. It is there as a safety valve in the event something were to happen, and we will talk about the perils of that and why the amendment should not be adopted.

For now, it looks as if we are lining up a number of amendments for tomorrow, including some amendments that should be in place with reference to global warming and some agreements and understanding regarding them. Later on, an amendment about the inventory of offshore assets, resources,

will be discussed and when that amendment to strike will be taken up. So we might have some understanding by morning on a series of votes.

For now, I do not think we are going to do anything else other than wrap up business, and we will take care of that in due course.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I want to speak about the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. My understanding is their board of directors is meeting today. I don't know whether they are going to select a new president for the corporation, but I know that was at least announced as the intention today of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Let me go all the way back to Big Bird. Everyone who grows up watching Sesame Street and Children's Television Workshop understands that Cookie Monster, Big Bird, and all of those things represent learning devices and the wonderful characters on Sesame Street. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting was created a long while ago as a part of an approach to do something unique.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Public Television, and National Public Radio have been pretty remarkable. Every week 94 million Americans watch public television or some portion of public television and 46 million people listen to public radio. That is a remarkable statistic. Public radio and public television are available to over 90 percent of American homes. We have come a long way since President Johnson signed the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967.

It is the case that public broadcasting will tackle issues that other broadcasters don't tackle. I admit you won't see Fear Factor on public television. You won't tune in and see someone sitting in front of a bowl of maggots to see whether they can eat an entire bowl in 15 or 30 seconds. That is not the kind of television I watch. But occasionally when you are browsing through the television routine, you tune in to programs that have that kind of approach. You wonder what has

become of good television. Or you might tune in to another program where you see a couple of women or men engaged in a fist fight over some romance that turned sour, where on that program day after day they hold this imperfection up to the light and say: Isn't this ugly? Let's entertain ourselves with everyone else's dysfunctional behavior.

You won't find that on public broadcasting. They sink their teeth into some pretty interesting things. I mentioned Big Bird. I suppose could you say Big Bird isn't quite so serious, but a lot of children grow up with Sesame Street watching Big Bird and the lessons therein. Frankly, it is wonderful television—more than television for children, I will give you an example of the kinds of things public broadcasting tackles that others will not.

Do you think ABC, CBS, NBC or FOX is going to tackle the question of concentration in broadcasting? There are no more than five or six companies and people that control what we see, hear, and read. Because we see all of these concentrations of television stations and radio stations, the Federal Communications Commission decided in their ruling, which the court subsequently stayed, that it is OK to open this up. And the Federal Communications Commission said: We believe that in one major American city, one company ought to be able to own eight radio stations, three television stations, the cable company, and the dominant newspaper. We think that is fine.

It is not fine with me. It is limiting what people can see and read and hear. The controversy surrounding public television, public radio, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting saddens me. My hope is that perhaps actions taken in the next couple of days might resolve that.

There is apparently a board meeting this afternoon and apparently another meeting of some type tomorrow where they will choose a new president. This all is with the backdrop of the chairman of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, who has consistently and publicly said that public broadcasting, public television, public radio has a liberal bias. There have been all of those allegations over some long period of time. A liberal bias, it is easy to say. It doesn't have a liberal bias. It is just independent television which most people appreciate.

Let me talk for a moment about my concern about where we are heading. Press accounts from last week noted that the House Appropriations Committee approved a spending bill on Thursday that would slash spending for public television and radio by nearly half. That includes a 25-percent cut in financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and a total of \$112 million in additional cuts for programs that provide continuing children's programming.

Just the news coming out of the Appropriations Committee in the House is

ominous. But more than that, inside the organization, the chairman of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting hired a consultant to evaluate the bias in public broadcasting. He hired a consultant to go after the program called "NOW with Bill Moyers." He hired that consultant without notifying the board of directors. This is the chairman of the board. He hired that consultant with public funds.

As an appropriator, I asked him: Would you provide me with the information that the consultant provided you.

This is what I received. I received a substantial amount of what he called raw data. It didn't include any summary, just raw data. I was struck and disappointed to see that a consultant was hired, and this is a summary of April 4 to June 4, just to pick one. And they go through the list of programs, and they label anti-Bush, anti-Bush, anti-DeLay. I guess if he reported on the controversy about TOM DELAY, it is anti-DeLay programming.

It says, "anticorporation." In fact, they did a program about some waste. It might have been about Halliburton, although I have done hearings on Halliburton. I guess that would then be declared anticorporation. It is really not. Again, it reads anti-Bush, anti-Bush, pro-Bush.

I am struck that it is way out of bounds to be paying money for a consultant who decides to evaluate public broadcasting through the prism of whether or not it supports the President. That is not the role of public broadcasting, to decide whether it supports the President of the United States. If we ever get to the point where you can't be critical of public policy, Democrats and Republicans, Congress and the President, then there is something wrong.

Interestingly enough, they used another approach on another set of programming, and they divided these segments that were shown into either liberal or conservative segments. And there was a segment on June 7 last year and Senator HAGEL from Nebraska, a conservative Republican, was on that segment and apparently said something that wasn't completely in sync with the White House. So he is labeled as a liberal. A conservative Republican Senator from Nebraska is labeled a liberal by the consultant for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Why? Because he said something liberal? No, apparently he just didn't have the party line down and said something that was perhaps at odds with policy coming out of the White House.

This list goes on and on. My guess is my colleague Senator HAGEL is going to be mighty surprised to discover that a consultant hired by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting views his appearances on public broadcasting as appearances that contribute to a liberal bias because a conservative Republican Senator from Nebraska shows up on public broadcasting.

I don't mean to make light of this. I think it is serious. In addition to all of this, an allegation of bias—a relentless allegation of bias by the chairman of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, in addition to his hiring a consultant to do this kind of thing—evaluate programming, whether it is anti-Bush or pro-Bush—in addition to all of that, there is now a discussion and potentially even a vote today in which they would select a new president of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and the leading candidate for that job is a former cochairman of the Republican National Committee.

I would not think it appropriate for a former cochair of the Democratic National Committee to assume the presidency of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; nor would I think it would be wise for Mr. Tomlinson, the chairman of the board, to usher in a former partisan as president of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Again, I only say that, going back some 35 years and more, I think public broadcasting has been a real service to our country. Public television and public radio tackle things other interests will not tackle in this country. They are, in fact, independent. That is precisely what drives some people half-wild. My hope is that the actions of Mr. Tomlinson, the chairman, the actions of the board, whatever they might be today—my hope is that those actions will not further contribute to injuring public broadcasting.

We fund public broadcasting because we think it is a great alternative to commercial television. If you tune in—nothing against broadcasts in the evening on the commercial station, but I happen to think Jim Lehrer has one of the best newscasts in our country. He covers both sides aggressively. I think it contributes to our country and I think, in many ways, public broadcasting is a national treasure. I regret that I have to describe these things—consultants who evaluate whether or not something is anti-Bush. That is not the prism through which one should evaluate whether something makes sense. I will wait to see what happens today at the meeting taking place of the board. My hope is that they will not take action that will further injure and be detrimental to public broadcasting.

#### 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF ANDRE'S FRENCH RESTAURANT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Chef Andre Rochat, the Dean of Las Vegas Chefs. Twenty-five years ago, he opened the doors to his first restaurant, Andre's French Restaurant. In the decades since, he has served patrons—including my wife Landra and I—the finest French cuisine in the city.

I first encountered Andre in the 1970s—a few years before he opened Andre's. At that time, he was operating the Savoy French Bakery and selling

the most wonderful pastries you could find. Bolstered by the bakery's success, he opened Andre's in 1980 in a converted Spanish-style home one block east of Las Vegas Boulevard. It was an unlikely location for a restaurant—but he quickly found success.

Twenty-five years later, Andre's has become what some have called the "most honored, awarded and respected restaurant in Las Vegas." The restaurant's intimate dining rooms, wonderful food and outstanding service have made it a landmark.

Andre's arrival in our city was the result of hard work and determination.

He was born in the Savoie region of the French Alps and inherited a love for his trade from his parents, who owned a delicatessen and butcher shop. At 14, Andre left home and began an apprenticeship at Leon de Lyon, in Lyon, France. After serving in the French Navy, Andre came to the United States in 1965, landing in Boston with just \$5 and his knives. Eventually, he made his way to Las Vegas and forever changed the city's dining scene.

Today Las Vegas is home to many great chefs. But Andre was one of the first. He now has two more restaurants in the city, and both of them continue in the award winning tradition begun by Andre's French Restaurant 25 years ago.

I congratulate Andre on 25 great years and thank him for sharing his outstanding gifts. Las Vegas is privileged to be able to enjoy his world-renowned talents, and it won't be long before Landra and I return to Andre's to enjoy our favorite meal, the Imported Dover Sole Sautee Véronique with Lemon Tarts for dessert.

#### TRIBUTE TO DRAKE DELANOY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Drake DeLanoy of Las Vegas, NV as he reaches two incredible milestones in life: his 55th wedding anniversary and his 77th birthday. For four decades, Drake has been a friend and mentor of mine, and I wish him and his wife Jackie all the best as they mark these two occasions.

Drake DeLanoy was raised in Reno. He graduated from the university of Nevada, Reno, and married Jackie on June 19, 1950. Drake earned his law degree from Denver University.

Following law school, Drake served in the United States Air Force and eventually returned to Nevada to practice law, which is where I had the good fortune of working with him.

Drake and I practiced together for 13 years, beginning in the mid-1960s. When we started working together, I was right out of law school and an inexperienced attorney. But Drake and his partners William Singleton and Rex Jameson took me under their wing.

These three men were great teachers who gave me the freedom to learn and grow. They let me take the legal cases I wanted to pursue, and they allowed me to watch them in the courtroom